DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 336 HE 001 915

AUTHOR	Oltman, Ruth M.
TITLE	Campus 1970, Where Do Women Stand? Research Report of a Survey on Women in Academe.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Univ. Women, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	47p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Association of University Women, Sales Office, 2401 Virginia Ave. N.W., Washinton D.C. 20037 ($0.50)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Personnel, Administrator Attitudes, *Decision Making, *Females, *Higher Education, *Participation, Special Programs, Students, Trustees, *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

This report describes the results of a questionnaire which was sent to presidents of 750 colleges and universities which hold institutional membership in the A.A.U.W.: 454 of these responded. The purpose of the questionnaire was to evaluate the activities of women and the extent to which they were involved in the university as students, administrators, faculty, and trustees. Specifically, an effort was made to determine the participation of women in decisionmaking; personnel policies affecting hiring, promotion, maternity leave, and nepotism; special programs designed for mature women students; utilization of women's abilities in major offices and committees, as department heads, principal administrators and trustees; and general attitudes of administration regarding women. The report presents the background of the study and related studies, the research procedure, a description of the total sample, the results of the study, and a summary and conclusions. (AF)

ED046336

CAMPUS 1970

WHERE DO WOMEN STAND?

Research Report of a Survey on Women in Academe

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE001915

Ruth M. Oltman, Ph.D.
Staff Associate, Higher Education
American Association of University Women
2401 Virginia Ave., N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

December 1970

Acknowledgements

For assistance in the preparation of the questionnaire I am indebted to members of the AAUW Committee on Standards in Higher Education and the AAUW Foundation Research Committee, as well as to staff members who gave suggestions. Dr. William Greybeal, Assistant Director, Research Division, NEA, provided most helpful technical advice. Mrs. Mary Helms coded the data and Mr. Perry Gann did the computer analysis. Mr. Nat Grant prepared the study for publication.

Mrs. Hazel Madsen developed the tables and painstakingly typed the copy in its many stages. While the study was in progress, Dr. Shirley McCune gave continued support and professional counsel and was an invaluable resource in the preparation of the final report.

To all -- my great appreciation.

RMO

ED046336

Contents

		Page
I	Introduction	
	A. Purpose	1
	B. Background and Related Studies	1
	C. Questions to be Answered	2
II	Research Procedure	
	A. The Questionnaire	4
III	Description of the Total Sample	
	A. Comparison with National Statistics	5
	B. Coeducational Status	6
	C. Enrollment of Institutions	6
	D. Public - Private Control	6
	E. Accrediting Regions	8
	F. Analysis of Subgroups	8
IV	Results of the Study	
	A. Method of Reporting	9
	B. Role of the Woman Student	9
	1. Positions of leadership on campus	9
	2. Programs for women	9
	a. General	11
	b. Association of Women Students (AWS)	11
	c. Representation on student-staff committees	11
	3. Policies on pregnancy, residence and birth control counseling	11
	4. Mature Women Students	14
	C. Women Administrators	14
	D. Faculty Women	17
	1. Department heads	17
	2. Representation	17
	3. Policies on maternity leave	17
	E. Policies on Nepotism	22
	F. Women Trustees	22
V	Summary and Conclusions	24

List of Tables

		Page
1	Comparison of Sample with National Statistics	5
2	Coed Status of Schools in Sample	6
3	Student Enrollment in Institutions Represented in Sample	6
4	Analysis of Public and Private Institutions in Sample	7
5	Accrediting Regions Represented in Sample	8
6	Students in Campus Leadership Positions (1967-70)	10
7	Programs for Women Students	12
8	Policies on Pregnancy, Residence and Birth Control Counseling	13
9	Programs for Mature Women Students	15
10A	Women in College Administration	16
10B	Administrative Positions for Which Qualified Women are Sought	18
11A	Departmental Chairmanships Held by Faculty Women	19
11B	Policies on Maternity Leave for Faculty Women	20
12	Policies on Nepotism	22
13	Women Trustees	23

Appendices

A Copy of letter to president of corporate member institutions

B Copy of questionnaire

C Coding breakdown

D Coding instructions

E Analysis of Sub-Groups in Study Sample

Bibliography

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose

In January 1970 a questionnaire was sent to presidents of the 750 colleges and universities which hold corporate (institutional) membership in the American Association of University Women. Its purpose was to evaluate the activities of women and the extent of their participation at all levels of involvement--as students, administrators, faculty, and trustees. An extensive questionnaire explored the participation of women in decision-making; personnel policies affecting hiring, promotion, maternity leave, nepotism; special programs designed for mature women students; utilization of women's abilities in major offices and committees, as department heads, principal administrators, and trustees; and general attitudes of administration regarding women.

B. Background and Related Studies

The study grew out of a recognition by the AAUW Committee on Standards in Higher Education that the potential of women is not being appreciated, encouraged, or fully developed at any level of higher education:--student body, administration, faculty, or Board of Trustees. It was recognized that very little data is available to document the role of women in higher education and that if any improvement in this role is to be achieved much more information must be obtained. It was hoped that objective documentation of some of the inequities would contribute to greater awareness of the limitations in opportunities for women in higher education. The need for objective information is evidenced by the extensive data-collecting presently being undertaken by women's caucuses of many professional groups and the amount of research being done by professional women, by faculty and women students and by state commissions on the status of women.

A major recommendation of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, was that "All agencies of the Federal Government that collect economic or social data about persons should collect, tabulate, and publish results by sex as well as race." (13) The need for this is evidenced by the fact that few government and educational publications include data analysis by sex in educational statistics. The most complete statistics on women's role are published by the Women's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor. These document the trends in the educational achievement (17) and employment status (16) of women, and projected trends for the future.

The National Science Foundation's Report on the 1968 Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel (12) gives data on the fields of employment and highest degrees earned by women scientists, who comprise nine percent of all scientists. The National Research Council (11) has published an analysis of doctoral recipients by sex in 26 academic disciplines. The Office of Education, in its annual Higher Education General Information Survey (HEGIS) study of institutions of higher education, has not provided analyses by sex, except for student enrollment (and for faculty rank in 1966). The National Education Association (NEA) completed a study on faculty ranks for 1959-66 and salaries for 1965-66 (10) which showed extensive differentials and evidence of the deterioration in the role of women as faculty members. NEA has not replicated this kind of research since, due to the difficulty in obtaining accurate data from the schools. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) also has not published a comparative analysis of ranks and salaries for men and women faculty. Statistics in higher education, therefore, do not give a clear

picture of the status of women as students, faculty or administrators. Equally important is the relative lack of up-to-date information about administrative practices which affect women in higher education, such as policies on maternity leave, nepotism, tenure, part-time appointments, and day care. Two studies of policies on nepotism have been done in the past ten years (3) (14). Information on women in non-professional jobs in higher education such as secretaries, house directors, and service personnel is also non-existent.

Further, there has been little analysis of the role of the woman student, although during the past year a number of student groups such as the Intercollegiate Association of Women Students (IAWS) and women's liberation groups on various campuses are forming their own commissions on the status of women students and examining their subordinate roles critically (7).

Psychological expectations of women also contribute much to the total picture. For example, the dilemma of women's conflict over achievement as non-feminine is well documented in Dr. Matina Horner's clinical study in Psychology Today (6). The cultural image and stereotypes of the female sex-role perpetuated by society undoubtedly form major impediments in early socialization of girls and in their ability to make full use of individual potential. They not only affect women's perceptions of themselves but also limit their perceptions of each other's resources and abilities, as Philip Goldberg's research has clearly demonstrated (4).

Little is known about the effect of pressures at the college level which limit the full intellectual development of women students or reinforce the results of previous negative socialization. Equally important is the quality of counseling provided at the college level which prepares women for their vocational, social and personal roles in society. Dr. Helen Astin's report (2) documents some of the factors which influenced the careers of women who earned Ph.D.'s in 1957. Early encouragement and definition of role were especially important. The career commitment of women doctorates is evidenced by the fact that 91 percent are working in their field of preparation, 81 percent full-time.

The present study was undertaken, therefore, to contribute additional data by surveying the role of women in institutions having corporate relationship to AAUW and an interest in and concern for women's education. It was anticipated also that the results would delineate areas for further study and action. The role of women in higher education and the extent of their participation was investigated by an assessing of some dimensions of the picture. It is not complete nor are the issues of causality probed. Results furnish a statement of what exists. Higher education reflects the society of which it is a part, including the values, attitudes and roles assigned to women, and the socialization process which prepares women to accept these roles.

C. Questions to be Answered

The concerns regarding the role of women in higher education were reflected in the following questions raised in preparing the questionnaire:

1. Women students
   a. What are their leadership roles on campus?
   b. To what extent do they participate in development of student policy? on student-staff committees?
   c. What campus programs are provided to meet their special needs in determining their roles as women?

d. What role does the Association of Women Students (AWS) play and how is it supported?
e. How many women go on for graduate study and receive financial aid, as compared with men?
f. What are the policies regarding pregnancy and birth control counseling?
g. What are the policies and programs for the mature woman student?

2. Women administrators
   a. What kinds of administrative positions are women most likely to hold?
   b. Are women sought for all types of administrative positions?
   c. To what extent are women administrators included in policy-making decisions?

3. Women faculty
   a. What department chairmanships are women most likely to hold?
   b. How do they participate on committees determining institutional or faculty policies?
   c. What institutional policies concern maternity leave?
   d. How do nepotism policies affect the hiring, promotions, tenure of women?

4. Women trustees
   a. How does the number of women trustees compare to the total number of men trustees?

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH PROCEDURE

A. The Questionnaire (see Appendix B)

A preliminary questionnaire was formulated and reviewed by members of the AAUW Committee on Standards in Higher Education, the Research Committee of the AAUW Educational Foundation, other members of the AAUW staff, and staff members of several other educational associations. Each question was examined for clarity of meaning, relevance to the purpose of the study and feasibility of response. Several revisions resulted from this process; Appendix B shows the final form. A letter (see Appendix A) then was sent to the president of each corporate member institution stating the purpose of the questionnaire and enclosing two copies, one to be retained in the files of the institution. An information copy also was sent to the AAUW liaison representative of each school surveyed. As questionnaires were returned they were coded and prepared for automatic data processing (see Appendices C and D for information on the methods used).

CHAPTER III

DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE

Four hundred fifty-four schools, or about two-thirds of the institutions surveyed, returned the four-page questionnaire.

A. Comparison with National Statistics

When compared to national statistics on four year institutions, the study sample is broadly representative, as Table 1 indicates, but differs significantly in several categories. The study sample has a larger percentage of public institutions and schools with over 10,000 enrollment and a smaller percentage of private schools and schools with under 5,000 enrollment. It does not differ significantly from the national population in the percentage of schools with under 1,000 enrollment or those with religious affiliation or coeducational classification.

Table 1

COMPARISON OF SAMPLE WITH NATIONAL STATISTICS
(4-year institutions)

Type of School	Percentage of Study Sample	National Percentage
Public	42	26[1]
Private	58	74[1]
Religious Affiliation	65	69[2]
Schools under 1,000 enrollment	21	25[1]
Schools under 5,000 enrollment	68	82[1]
Schools over 10,000 enrollment	14	9[1]
Coeducational	83	80[2]

1 Information from (8) for fall 1968.
2 Information from (9) for fall 1969.

The sample reflects the makeup of the corporate membership* in AAUW. While it does not match the national distribution in all respects, it does include representation in all categories.

* A college or university whose alumnae are eligible for individual membership in AAUW may apply for institutional or corporate membership in AAUW, which entitles them to certain benefits.

B. Coeducational Status

Eighty-three percent of the schools in the study sample are coeducational; 13 percent enroll women only. The remaining four percent includes coordinate colleges such as Radcliffe and a few which are essentially women's colleges but enroll a small number of men (see Table 2).

Table 2

COED STATUS OF SCHOOLS IN SAMPLE

Type of School	Number	Percentage
Coeducational	376	83
Women only	59	13
Coordinate	6	1
Other	13	3
Total	454	100

C. Enrollment of Institutions

Two hundred seventeen or 48 percent of the schools in the study sample have student enrollments of less than 2,000. Only 14 percent enroll 10,000 or more (see Table 3). The mode number of students for the sample is in the 2,000-3,000 range.

Table 3

STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN INSTITUTIONS REPRESENTED IN SAMPLE

Number of Students	Number	Percentage
Under 1,000	93	21
1,001-2,000	124	27
2,001-3,000	45	10
3,001-5,000	45	10
5,001-10,000	84	18
10,001-15,000	28	6
15,001-25,000	25	6
Over 25,000	10	2
Total	454	100

D. Public-Private Control

Forty-two percent of the sample are public institutions, the majority being state-supported schools. Only two percent are municipally controlled (see Table 4).

Table 4

ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS IN SAMPLE

Type of Institution	Number	Percentage
Public School	189	42
State	186	98
Municipal	3	2
Private Schools	265	58
Religious Affiliation	173	65
Independent	92	35
Total	454	100

Of the 265 private schools, 65 percent have some kind of religious affiliation. Institutions with religious affiliation represent 15 different denominations. The churches include Catholic (31 percent), Methodist (18 percent), Presbyterian (13 percent), Baptist (9 percent), Lutheran (9 percent), United Church of Christ (5 percent), Disciples of Christ (4 percent), Friends (2 percent), and, in smaller proportions, Mennonite, Church of the Brethren, Reformed, Moravian, Nazarene, Assembly of God, and Seventh Day Adventists.

E. Accrediting Regions

Table 5 shows the distribution of the sample in the six accrediting regions. The sample, like the population, has a heavy representation of the North Central and Southern Accrediting Regions.

Table 5

ACCREDITING REGIONS REPRESENTED IN SAMPLE

Region	Number	Percentage
North Central	190	42
Southern	103	23
Middle States	86	19
Eastern	29	6
Northwestern	29	6
Western	16	4
Total	454	100

F. Analysis of Subgroups

Appendix E gives an analysis of all subgroups in the study sample, according to governance, enrollment, accrediting region and coeducational status.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

A. Method of Reporting

Results are reported by types of schools to avoid distortion of data by differences among the categories such as private, public, and coeducational schools, women's colleges, and schools with enrollment over 10,000 or under 1,000. Women's colleges were extracted from the sample of private schools and small colleges so that appropriate comparisons could be made with public schools and institutions with over 10,000 enrollment. In order to make valid comparisons among groups of different sizes, all data were changed to percentages.

The four-page questionnaire required extensive compilation of data on the role of women on the college campus. In many instances this information was not obtainable from one office or was not collected by the school. As a result, no response was given for some questions. Although instructions asked the respondent to distinguish between information that was "unavailable" (UA) or "did not apply" (DNA), the answers were often left blank. For this reason, percentages given for the data were computed on the number of actual responses to the question.

Information was not tabulated on seniors going on to graduate school, number of graduate fellowships and value, as this data was not given in consistent form, was not available, or the item was left blank.

B. Role of the Woman Student

Women students comprised approximately 41 percent of the total student population in four-year institutions of higher education in the United States in the fall of 1969 (15). Almost 2,400,000 women were enrolled in degree-credit programs during the 1969-70 school year, more than double the number enrolled ten years earlier. What has been the quality of their education? How are they being prepared for leadership? What campus programs are provided to meet their special needs? The questionnaire explored four areas in an effort to shed some light on the role of the woman student on the campuses surveyed.

1. Positions of Leadership on Campus

Analysis of campus offices (see Table 6, p. 10) most likely to be held by women on campus show that women students are most frequently found in positions which are primarily non-elective or appointive, such as editor of the yearbook or literary magazine, or chairman of the activities committee or freshman orientation--all positions requiring special skills, such as writing, and detail work. Greater opportunities for leadership are open to women on small campuses (under 1,000) or at private institutions (and women's colleges not included in this tabulation) than at very large, public or coeducational institutions.

Men are most likely to hold the elective, political offices such as president of the student body, class president, chairman of the Campus Judicial Board or Union Board of Governors--all positions with much power and influence. Again, these trends are accentuated on the large campuses and at public or coeducational schools. There is a tendency toward co-chairmanships (men and women) for positions such as chairman of freshman orientation or activities committee, some editorships, or judicial boards.

2. Programs for Women

The study committee was particularly interested in knowing the kinds of

Table 6

STUDENTS IN CAMPUS LEADERSHIP POSITIONS (1967-70) **

Position	Coed Schools (376)			Public Schools (189)			Private Schools * (207)			Schools over 10,000 (63)			Schools under 1,000 * (53)		
	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-sponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-sponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses
President, Student Body	84	5	370	86	4	188	77	12	204	92	2	63	67	18	51
Class President	76	6	294	75	8	138	69	13	179	80	5	41	60	22	45
Chrmn, Union Board of Governors	65	12	209	64	13	125	63	15	92	62	11	47	69	16	19
Captain, Debate	65	8	170	60	13	96	68	10	85	79	3	38	77	8	13
Chrmn, Campus Judicial Board	68	12	252	77	13	124	55	17	147	74	6	46	55	18	33
Editor, Yearbook	17	49	362	19	46	183	15	54	201	25	48	61	12	52	50
Chrmn, Activities Committee	47	27	259	47	30	128	43	31	150	42	22	36	33	38	42
Chrmn, Freshman Orientation	40	24	259	44	26	124	35	29	156	44	28	43	40	32	35
Editor, Literary Magazine	39	30	263	43	23	127	33	41	153	49	16	49	17	63	30
Editor, Campus Paper	39	25	373	40	24	186	36	31	209	53	18	62	23	46	52

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

** To provide a clear picture of women's participation, instances are tabulated in which women held these offices at least 2/3 of the time during 1967-70. Instances of incumbency for one year only are not shown.

events or special media which are planned on campus to meet the educational needs of the woman student in developing her potential, in determining her role, and in planning her future. Three areas were explored in the questionnaire:

a. General. Only 72 percent of the total study group responded to the question, "During the past year we have had _____ programs (lectures, seminars, workshops, movies, etc.) related to the role or special educational needs of women." Forty-six percent of those responding, however, indicated they had no such programs, another 21 percent only one or two. Differences among the subgroups were marked--e.g. 72 percent of the coeducational schools had had none or no more than two such programs during the year, as compared to 42 percent of the women's colleges. Institutions over 10,000 and public schools, with more diverse resources and population, provided more programs than small colleges and private schools (see Table 7a, p. 12).

As so many institutions failed to respond to this item, it is possible that the actual percentage of schools having no programs is much higher than 46 percent. However, there are three schools (all small colleges under 1,000) with an accredited course on women. Nearly 10 percent (and over 15 percent of the women's colleges) state that they have had more than 10 identifiable programs, a "series" or "many" such programs, furnishing some hopeful evidence that the needs are being recognized.

b. Association of Women Students (AWS). Over 58 percent of the schools report that they have an Association of Women Students or a similar women's organization on campus. The percentage is lower on all women's campuses where the overall student government serves this purpose, and higher on larger public campuses, where there is diversity of governmental functions (see Table 7b, p. 12). Approximately 60 percent of the AWS groups have independent budgets.

c. Representation on student-staff committees. Four hundred twelve of the 454 schools answered the question on representation of women students on student-staff committees, 43 percent indicating that women are represented "in smaller numbers, proportionately, than men." This percentage increases to 48 percent at coeducational schools, 50 percent at public schools, and 67 percent at schools over 10,000 (see Table 7c, p. 12). Schools under 1,000 show the largest participation of women.

3. Policies on Pregnancy, Resident, and Birth Control Counseling

Policies in this area vary greatly (see Table 8, p. 13). Most schools (98 percent) indicated that they do "permit pregnant women students to attend classes" and do "make necessary adjustments for them to complete their courses." Eighty-eight percent indicate that "married women, not living with their husbands, may live in the residence halls," but only 62 percent state that pregnant women may do so. Birth control information or counseling is provided by the Health Service in 43 percent of the schools surveyed; the others "make referrals to physicians outside the institution." It may be that many schools avoid the situation and do not attempt to handle the problem in either way.

Data indicate that large public institutions, with medical resources and a heterogeneous population of students are likely to be liberal in policy and to provide special services to the married or pregnant woman student. Small

Table 7

PROGRAMS FOR WOMEN STUDENTS

Question	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
a. No. of programs on women's interests in 1969-70		328		276		38		44		46		136		160
None	46		51		18		39		63		46		51	
1-2	21		21		24		16		24		18		22	
3-6	15		12		32		11		4		16		10	
7-10	4		4		5		9		0		6		2	
11-20	3		2		5		4		0		3		3	
Over 20	2		2		5		5		2		1		3	
Series	2		2		0		2		0		1		3	
Accredited course	1		0		3		0		4		0		1	
Many	3		2		5		7		2		3		3	
Some	4		4		3		7		0		6		3	
b. AWS		428		369		42		61		53		183		207
Have an Association of Women Students on campus Yes	58		61		38		67		55		65		57	
No	42		39		62		33		45		35		43	
c. Representation on student-staff committees:		412		369	DNA			63		52		184		205
As proportionately as men	44		45				33		52		44		46	
Proportionately less than men	43		48				67		29		50		43	
Proportionately more than men	13		7				0		19		6		11	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

Table 8

POLICIES ON PREGNANCY, RESIDENCE AND BIRTH CONTROL COUNSELING

Question	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
Permit pregnant women students to attend classes, will make academic adjustments needed		440		365		56		62		53		184		204
Yes	98		99		93		100		100		98		98	
No	2		1		7		0		0		2		2	
Permit pregnant women students to live in residence halls		394		324		43		54		48		161		184
Yes	62		64		47		78		58		75		55	
No	38		36		53		22		42		25		45	
Married women may live in residence halls		428		352		58		58		53		176		198
Yes	88		91		74		97		87		95		87	
No	12		9		26		3		13		5		13	
Birth control information available in Health Service		415		346		53		62		49		178		189
Yes	43		47		30		68		24		52		38	
No	57		53		70		32		76		48		62	
Birth control information not provided, but referrals made to outside doctors		299		242		41		28		42		113		147
Yes	59		62		44		54		52		61		60	
No	41		38		56		46		48		39		40	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

and private schools are almost as liberal in policy but do not generally furnish counseling in their health services, perhaps because of limitation of facilities and staff. The sample of women's colleges appears to be the most conservative on all aspects of policy and birth control counseling, although it had been anticipated that they would lead the way in services of this kind to their students because of their special role in women's education.

4. Mature Women Students

Only a small proportion of the schools surveyed were able to give statistics on the approximate number of mature women students enrolled. Ninety-five percent, however, indicated (see Table 9, p. 15) that opportunities for completing a degree are available, 86 percent that some kind of counseling is provided, although the nature of this was not defined in the answers. In addition, 70 percent stated that scholarship aid is given when needed. Only 49 percent, however, make some adjustments in class hours or curricula to meet the needs of such students and less than half (43 percent) have a program (such as continuing education) especially designed for the returning mature woman student. Of the 454 schools, only 22 or five percent provide some kind of day care services for students with small children.

It should be noted that women's colleges are the most likely to provide counseling and day care services and to make adjustments for mature women. Large schools with over 10,000 enrollment have more facilities for special programs but do not provide extensive individual services. On the other hand, small schools with less than 1,000 students do not have diversified special facilities but appear to make up for this in more individualized treatment--counseling, needed adjustments, and scholarships. Private schools show a similar trend.

C. Women Administrators

In answering the question "It is our policy to include women in a. top-level administrative positions" and b. "policy-making decisions," 87 to 92 percent of the total sample indicated affirmative responses. The most positive responses came from the sample of women's colleges, the large universities with enrollments over 10,000 stating more reservations.

In spite of such affirmative policy, however, this actual participation of women in administrative policy-making in higher education is conspicuously lacking, as Table 10A, p. 16, demonstrates. The position of women in administration is similar to that of women students--they are working at jobs requiring skills and attention to detail but without much relationship to policy-making or influence. Generally they are in positions at middle management level or which involve sex stereotypes, such as Dean of Nursing.

The study points up the comparatively greater opportunities for women in the administration of women's colleges and in schools with under 1,000 enrollment, especially in certain categories. In addition to the position of Dean of Women, women are most likely to hold positions such as head librarian, director of placement, director of financial aid or college counselor. They are least likely to be found in the positions of president, vice president, director of development, business manager, academic dean, dean of students, director of counseling, and college physician.

It should be noted that women are less likely to be head librarians in schools with enrollment over 10,000 and in public institutions than in private schools or

Table 9

PROGRAMS FOR MATURE WOMEN STUDENTS

Question	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000.* (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
Provide opportunities for mature women to complete degrees		448		370		59		61		53		188		206
Yes	95		95		98		95		98		96		95	
No	5		5		2		5		2		4		5	
Provide counseling for mature women		441		364		58		59		52		186		201
Yes	86		84		95		85		90		86		84	
No	14		16		5		15		10		14		16	
Provide scholarship help for mature women		434		359		56		60		53		182		200
Yes	70		72		62		60		78		72		71	
No	30		28		38		40		22		28		29	
Make adjustments in curriculum for mature women		432		360		53		59		53		183		201
Yes	49		46		60		49		53		50		45	
No	51		54		40		51		47		50		55	
Have special program for mature women		440		364		57		61		53		185		203
Yes	44		43		53		64		32		52		34	
No	56		57		47		36		68		48		66	
Provide day care services		444		366		59		61		53		185		204
Yes	5		4		9		5		2		5		3	
No	95		96		91		95		98		95		97	

*Exclusive of women's colleges.

Table 10A

WOMEN IN COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION **

(1967-70)

	Total Group (454)			Coed Schools (376)			Women's Colleges Only (59)			Schools over 10,000 (63)			Schools under 1,000 * (53)			Public Schools (189)			Private Schools * (207)		
	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re ponses	% Men 3 yrs	% Women 2-3 yrs	Total Re-ponses
President	88	11	441	95	5	366	50	47	56	100	--	58	87	13	53	97	3	184	92	8	200
Vice President	93	4	290	97	2	246	69	17	29	100	--	55	85	8	26	98	--	123	94	4	138
Director of Development	95	4	381	97	2	314	86	6	50	98	--	52	98	3	47	96	1	140	97	3	189
Business Manager	90	9	437	93	5	362	66	32	56	98	2	58	92	4	53	97	1	180	90	9	200
College Physician	82	8	397	82	7	325	82	13	55	68	10	60	95	5	42	80	9	162	83	7	179
Director Financial Aid	70	23	440	79	15	364	21	67	57	85	12	61	61	32	51	84	9	183	71	23	201
Director Placement	64	28	429	72	21	355	22	73	55	80	10	59	59	33	49	80	14	179	62	30	196
Director Counseling	76	19	319	82	13	273	30	67	30	92	5	61	61	32	28	88	9	150	73	20	138
Dean of Students	71	23	419	82	12	343	12	83	57	86	5	57	70	26	50	85	9	174	76	18	189
Head Librarian	57	35	445	63	29	368	23	61	57	85	8	61	36	62	53	69	22	184	56	37	204
Academic Dean	69	18	432	76	10	359	31	62	55	50	17	60	77	15	52	74	8	178	76	14	198
Asso. or Asst. Academic Dean	68	17	261	74	12	223	32	44	25	63	12	60	67	20	15	73	11	121	72	16	116
College Counselor	36	25	318	38	17	265	27	51	41	18	16	49	58	26	31	35	19	140	39	22	139

** To provide a clear picture of women's participation, instances are tabulated in which women held these offices at least 2/3 of the time during 1967-70. Instances of incumbency for one year only are not shown.

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

schools with enrollment under 1,000. The same holds true for the positions of placement director, director of counseling, dean of students, assistant academic dean and director of financial aid. Categories such as president, director of development, college physician and business manager show little differential among institutions, despite size or type, except at the women's colleges, where women do hold many positions of responsibility.

Further evidence of the lack of utilization of women power in college administration is seen in the answers to an open-ended question which asked for a list of all positions in the administrative staff for which qualified women are generally sought. Only 19 percent of the schools indicated that they specifically seek "qualified persons, regardless of sex, except for Dean of Men and Dean of Women" and another nine percent answered generally "any position." The 454 schools in the survey listed only 427 such positions, an average of less than one position per school. Table 10B, p. 18, shows the distribution of responses in ten categories including all positions listed at least two percent or more. Again, there appear to be broader opportunities in women's colleges, fewer in the large universities.

D. Faculty Women

Nationally, women comprise about 22 percent of faculty at all ranks in higher education in the United States (4). Percentage of women decreases, however, as rank increases, with less than nine percent holding the rank of full professor (10). They are particularly absent at some of the "prestige" institutions and often are employed in non-tenured teaching positions.

1. Department Heads

It should be noted that 90 percent of the schools surveyed answered "yes" to the question "Our promotional policies are the same for men and women faculty." Data show, however, that women infrequently hold department chairmanships. Thirty-four of the schools in this study indicate no women as heads of academic departments, and the average number of women in such positions in all schools was 2.6 per school. When they are department chairmen, they are found primarily in the fields of home economics, physical education, English, languages, nursing and education. The opportunities in the women's colleges, however, are greater than in other schools, particularly in areas of the sciences, math, history and government and art. Table 11A, p. 19, gives all department categories mentioned two percent or more of the total listings.

2. Representation

Women at 35 percent of the schools surveyed are said to be represented on almost all faculty committees and boards and in other schools women appear to participate in diversified activities of the faculty such as the University Senate, Faculty Council, Administrative Council, committees on academic standing, student life and curriculum. They are less likely to be represented on committees for guidance, scholarships, judicial problems, long range planning, institutional research, admissions, educational or advisory policy, or to be advisers to campus organizations.

3. Policies on Maternity Leave for Faculty Women

Seventy-nine percent of the schools have an official policy on maternity leave. Fifty-eight percent indicate that the time for such leave is "adjusted as needed." Only six percent stated that two months or less is granted; the other 36 percent grant 3-18 months for maternity leave. Most of the institutions continue fringe benefits during this period and will rehire in the same position and salary without loss of seniority. The questions, however, did not explore the application of these policies to women faculty without tenure. (See Table 11B, p. 20.)

Table 10B

ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS FOR WHICH QUALIFIED WOMEN ARE SOUGHT +

Question	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
Qualified persons regardless of sex, except Deans of Men and Women	19	427	19	347	17	53	17	64	13	38	22	184	16	186
Women's Counselor	10		10		6		8		8		10		11	
Asso. Dean of Students	10		11		6		5		21		11		11	
Any position at all	9		8		17		2		13		7		9	
Dean of Nursing	8		9		2		16		-		12		5	
Dean of Students	5		2		23		5		8		2		3	
Dean of Home Economics	5		6		-		14		3		9		2	
Registrar	4		5		-		-		8		1		8	
Director of Admissions	3		2		8		3		-		3		2	
Librarian	3		3		4		-		5		3		3	
Director of Placement	2		3		2		2		-		3		2	
Asst. to Dean	2		2		2		5		3		2		2	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.
+ Percentages represent proportion of total positions listed.

Table 11A

DEPARTMENTAL CHAIRMANSHIPS HELD BY FACULTY WOMEN +

Department	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
None	3	1217	4	913	--	248	1	199	5	131	3	438	4	509
Home Economics	13		15		6		21		8		21		10	
Physical Education	9		10		7		14		6		15		7	
English, Journalism, Speech or Theatre Arts	8		8		9		4		11		8		8	
Languages	8		8		10		4		12		6		11	
Nursing	8	(Or 2.6 per school)	9	(Or 2.4 per school)	4	(or 4 per school)	11	(Or 3.1 per school)	5	(Or 2.5 per school)	10	(Or 2.25 per school)	7	(Or 2.5 per school)
Education	6		6		6		3		7		2		7	
Business Administration abd Economics	6		6		3		4		5		7		6	
Mathematics	4		4		6		0		8		3		5	
Fine Arts, History of Art	5		4		6		1		6		4		5	
Biology and Earth Science	4		3		9		8		3		3		3	
History, Government, Political Science	4		4		6		4		2		3		4	
Physical Science	4		2		7		1		4		1		4	
Sociology and Anthropology	4		3		4		2		3		2		3	
Psychology	3		3		4		9		5		3		3	
Music	2		3		2		1		2		2		2	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.
+ Percentages represent proportion of total number of chairmanships listed.

Table 11B

POLICIES ON MATERNITY LEAVE FOR FACULTY WOMEN

Question	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
Have policy		430		356		54		58		52		178		198
Yes	79		81		67		81		77		82		78	
No	10		9		20		12		12		9		10	
No specific policy	11		10		13		7		11		9		12	
Period of time		308		262		31		45		34		137		139
Adjusted as needed	58		58		61		60		59		57		59	
2 months or less	6		5		10		4		12		4		5	
3-6 months	19		20		13		20		26		20		20	
2 semesters	3		3		3		0		0		2		4	
12-18 months	14		10		13		0		3		16		12	
Rehire in same position		310		265		30		41		34		141		138
Yes	93		93		93		93		94		94		92	
No	7		7		7		7		6		6		8	
Rehire in same level		294		251		27		39		34		136		130
Yes	97		97		96		95		100		97		97	
No	3		3		4		5		0		3		3	
Rehire at same salary		289		246		27		38		32		134		127
Yes	97		97		96		95		97		97		97	
No	3		3		4		5		3		3		3	
Rehire without loss of seniority		295		253		27		39		35		136		131
Yes	96		97		89		95		97		98		95	
No	4		3		11		5		3		2		5	
Continue fringe benefits		349		295		37		46		39		160		150
Yes	88		87		92		83		82		86		89	
No	12		13		8		17		18		14		11	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

E. Policies on Nepotism

Almost 35 percent of the schools reporting indicate that they have specific policies against nepotism in hiring of faculty. Nepotism policies are most evident on campuses of large schools, least evident at private and women's colleges and small campuses (see Table 12, p. 22). In general, they affect husband-wife, parent-child and siblings relationships in the same proportion, although fewer schools answered questions on the latter two than on the first.

There was a definite indication that, where policies are in force, they are more prevalent for hiring a husband and wife in the same department than in different departments. There is evidence, also, of some flexibility in application, 38 percent stating that there are some departmental exceptions.

In comparing the findings of this survey with those done in the AAUW study by Dolan and Davis in 1960, (3) there appears to have been some liberalizing of nepotism regulations in the public institutions in the past 10 years, but little change in the private sector, as the figures below indicate.

Anti-Nepotism Regulations at Corporate Member Institutions

	No limitation		*Specific Rules or Flexible Rules*	
	1960	1970	1960	1970
Public schools	32.1%	54.8%	67.7%	45.2%
Private schools	71.0	72.7	28.8	27.3
Total	55.4	65.2	44.5	34.8

F. Women Trustees

We are hearing more and more about the appointment of women trustees in our colleges and universities but they still are not represented as fully as they should be in view of enrollment of women and number of alumnae, particularly at the large public universities. Twenty-one percent of the schools surveyed had no women trustees and the percentage in this category is much higher for institutions with over 10,000 enrollment (32 percent), public schools (26 percent), and coeducational schools (24 percent). (See Table 13, p. 23.)

Twenty-five percent of the total sample have a token woman on the board, with the percentage of those having only one woman again shown as much higher at large public schools. Sixty-six percent of the women's colleges and 16 percent of the schools with under 1,000 students have six or more women trustees, but only two percent of schools with 10,000 or more students and three percent of the public institutions. The overall governance of an institution is obviously reflected in its policies. Does the lack of women in the top governing board have a relationship to some of the differentials among institutions which have been previously noted? This is an area meriting further research.

Table 12

POLICIES ON NEPOTISM

Question		Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
		%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
Have policy against			414		349		47		63		48		175		192
	Yes	35		36		28		56		15		45		27	
	No	65		64		72		44		85		55		73	
Husband-wife, same dept. 1968-69			330		279		37		44		39		143		149
	Yes	58		59		46		77		38		62		56	
	No	42		41		54		23		62		38		44	
Husband-wife, same dept. 1969-70			322		270		39		41		38		139		143
	Yes	59		60		51		73		45		64		57	
	No	41		40		49		27		55		36		43	
Husband-wife, diff. dept. 1968-69			359		305		39		50		48		153		166
	Yes	88		90		69		94		79		95		85	
	No	12		10		31		6		21		5		15	
Husband-wife, diff. dept. 1969-70			340		289		38		47		43		143		159
	Yes	85		89		71		92		72		93		82	
	No	15		11		29		8		28		7		18	
Parent-child			298		256		30		51		35		97		130
	Yes	55		58		30		75		26		69		47	
	No	45		42		70		25		74		31		53	
Siblings			294		252		30		47		36		136		127
	Yes	53		56		23		75		25		68		45	
	No	47		44		77		25		75		32		55	
Dept. exceptions			271		228		30		43		30		123		118
	Yes	39		42		20		49		13		44		38	
	No	61		58		80		51		87		56		62	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

Table 13

WOMEN TRUSTEES

Number	Total Group (454)		Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's	%	No. R's
None	21	438	24	365	4	53	32	60	21	53	26	184	22	201
1	25		29		2		42		11		41		17	
2	18		19		8		16		15		19		19	
3	10	Mode	11	Mode	7	Mode	6	Mode	13	Mode	7	Mode	13	Mode
4-5	10	= 2	9	= 2	13	= 7	2	= 1	24	= 3	4	= 1	15	= 2
6-9	10		6		38		0		10		2		10	
10 or more	6		2		28		2		6		1		4	

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Results of the survey add to the increasing accumulation of data that women do not have equal status with men in academe. At every level--student body, administration, faculty, and trustees--women are under-represented or placed in positions with little power in decision-making. This is particularly true in the large public institutions. When they are represented, it is more often in the smaller or women's colleges where there is a shortage of men and when they have special skills in specific areas which have sex stereotypes.

Opinion or policy does not always equate with fact--e.g. 90 percent of the schools state that their promotional policies are the same for men and women faculty, yet in 34 schools (all coeducational) there are no women department heads and the mean number of women department heads in all schools is less than three per institution. Ninety percent stated that they do include women in top-level administrative positions. Yet women administrators are seldom employed in positions involving critical decision making and are not actively recruited at higher levels. In this period of increased student involvement in campus governance, 43 percent indicated that women students are represented in proportionately smaller numbers than men on student-staff committees. Forty-six percent indicated that during the past year they had had no programs related to the special educational needs of women on campus.

The study was, of necessity, a very general one, attempting to define the extent of women's involvement on campus and to create an awareness of discrimination where it may exist. In view of the variation in total responses from question to question, it is possible that the picture is not as favorable to women as the percentages may indicate, at first glance, as the number of "no responses" may contain a large proportion of negative answers.

Results point to a number of unanswered questions, indicating need for further study in depth, such as, for example, on nepotism and maternity policies for faculty women.

The study illustrates in a rather dramatic fashion the sex inequities on American campuses and suggests many areas in which AAUW and its corporate member institutions might be involved in increasing utilization of women at all levels in academe. The major areas indicated for action now are:

1) development of more opportunities for women students in genuine leadership positions and participation in campus governance.

2) development of better counseling and more programs specifically designed to meet the unique educational needs of women students, including the mature students.

3) recruitment and employment of more women in administrative positions on campus and greater participation in high-level policy making.

4) appointment or election of more women trustees, particularly in coeducational schools and the large public institutions.

5) improvement in recruitment of women for faculty and in promotional policies for faculty women, and examination of institutional policies which may contribute to covert or overt discrimination.

6) elimination of regulations against nepotism in hiring and adoption of clear policies of employment on the basis of merit and training.

7) establishment of clear maternity policies for all faculty women.

Other areas not covered by the study but which should be examined are:

1) the recruitment of women for graduate schools, necessitating a close look at how women are motivated and counseled in their undergraduate years.

2) the incentives offered to women in the way of stipends for graduate study.

3) quotas or limitations placed on admission of women to graduate schools.

4) the employment of college women after graduation--breadth of opportunity, training, salaries.

The needs are clearly established. Courageous leadership is imperative in assisting women in higher education to realize their potential and to make their maximum contribution to the academic community.

Appendix A

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN 2401 VIRGINIA AVE., N.W. / WASHINGTON, D.C. 20037
Phone 202/338-4300

January 16, 1970

Dear President:

In September you received a pamphlet on "Corporate Membership in AAUW," describing the relationship of AAUW to the corporate member institutions. It is our hope that such membership will provide an avenue for our discussion of issues in higher education and for action in their resolution. Such a relationship, therefore, can be a mutually beneficial one, serving both the needs of your institution and the program of AAUW. The services of the AAUW Educational Foundation, described in the enclosed pamphlet, are but one phase of AAUW's contributions to higher education.

At its meeting in Washington in November 1969 the Board of Directors of AAUW passed the following resolution:

"The Board of Directors of the American Association of University Women believe that we must renew our efforts to achieve full human status for women, guaranteeing to them freedom to choose from a wide range of alternatives in private, social, economic, and public life.

"To be free is to have the right to choose the life style most suited to one's own aptitudes, abilities, and desires. Prevailing mores in both private and public sectors do not, at present, permit women to have such freedom.

"To provide a greater range of alternatives to women will require a planned effort to change our own attitudes and those of other women as well as to change attitudes and practices of men, employers, and of government agencies and policy-makers. It means revising educational methods and materials used in teaching girls to be women; it means training educational and vocational counselors to understand and accept a new concept of women and their equal participation in society. It means understanding and accepting the re-structure of the family which has been made inevitable by changing population, social and economic.

"The Board of Directors urges support by all members, branches and state divisions of new efforts to achieve equal status and a complete range of alternatives for women. The Association and the AAUW Educational Foundation will actively seek avenues and means by which we may make a positive contribution toward this goal."

One aspect of the new thrust will be examination of the status of women on campus--students, administrators and faculty. Therefore, AAUW is turning to its corporate members for assistance in assessing the current position. May we enlist your interest and help in completing the enclosed questionnaire, as it relates to your institution? You may wish to ask your liaison representative, who is an AAUW member, to assist in its preparation. Should a specific answer to any question be impossible to obtain, please give your closest estimate or mark "information unavailable" (IU). When the questionnaire is returned, would you also be willing to send us a copy of your faculty handbook? This would be most appreciated in our study of the regulations governing faculty, and of faculty women in particular. A self-addressed envelope, on which we will pay the postage, is enclosed for the convenience of your reply. May we have your response by March 1?

It is always a privilege to share our concerns with our corporate members and to work together for common goals. We plan to continue our regular communications and we hope we may be of service to you. We welcome your suggestions as to how AAUW may better cooperate with the member institutions in the future.

Sincerely yours,

Ruth M. Oltman

Ruth M. Oltman, Ph.D.
Staff Associate - Higher Education

RMO:hlm
Enclosures

A summary report on the results of this questionnaire will be sent to you in a later mailing to corporate member institutions.

Appendix B

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN
2401 Virginia Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

F E M I N I Q U E

Institution

Address

CODE (Office use only)

1-2

3-4

(Indicate any explanatory note or detail on the back of the sheet, noting the number of the question.)

A. Institutional Control
(Check those that apply, or specify, as indicated.)

5-6

1. Public

a. Federal _____
b. State _____
c. County _____
d. City _____
e. Other (specify) _____

2. Private

a. Independent, non-profit _____
b. Religious affiliation (specify) _____
c. Other (specify) _____

7-8

9-10

11

3. Coed _____ Women only _____ When did your school become coed? _____ Year

12-13

B. Students

1. The following positions of leadership on our campus have been held by men or women students (mark sex of person M or F, as appropriate, or NA if no such position exists):

	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	
a. President of student body				14
b. Chairman of the campus judicial board				15
c. Chairman of the activities committee				16
d. Editor of a campus newspaper				17
e. Editor of the yearbook				18
f. Editor of a literary magazine				19
g. President of the honors council				20
h. Captain of the debate team				21
i. Class president				22
j. Chairman of orientation for freshman				23
k. Chairman of Union Senate or Union Board of Governors				24
l. Officer in S.D.S. or other radical group				25
m. Other major positions (specify)				26
_____				27-28

2. Graduate study	1968	1969	
a. Number of our seniors graduating			29-30
Men			31-32
Women			33-34

	1968	1969	CODE (Office use only)
b. Number of our seniors going on to graduate school	____	____	35-36
Men	____	____	37-38
Women	____	____	39-40
c. Number of fellowships, scholarships, or stipends (exclusive of Federal grants) awarded for graduate study to our seniors	____	____	41-42
Men	____	____	43-44
Women	____	____	45-46
d. Annual monetary value of awards (excluding Federal grants)	____	____	47-48
Men	____	____	49-50
Women	____	____	51-52

3. During the past year we have had _____ programs (lectures, seminars, workshops, movies, etc.) related to the role of special educational needs of women. (Use reverse side to give examples.) 53-54

4. a. We have an Association of Women Students (AWS) or similar all-campus organization to represent women's special interests on our campus. Yes _____ No _____ 55

   b. (If so) this organization has an independent budget established by the institution (or an established percentage of the activity fee). Yes _____ No _____ 56

5. Check which of the following most nearly describes how adequately women are represented on our student-staff committees (e.g. University Senate, faculty committees, etc.).

   a. as proportionately as men _____

   b. in smaller numbers, proportionately, than men _____ 57

   c. in greater numbers, proportionately, than men _____

6. Pregnancy

   a. It is our policy to permit pregnant women students to attend classes and to make the necessary academic adjustments for them to complete their courses. Yes _____ No _____ 58

   b. Pregnant women students are permitted to live in the residence halls. Yes _____ No _____ 59

7. Married women, not living with their husbands, may live in the resident halls. Yes _____ No _____ 60

8. Birth control information and counseling

   a. is provided in our Health Service for our students Yes _____ No _____ 61

   b. is not provided on campus but we make referrals to physicians outside the institution Yes _____ No _____ 62

C. Mature Women Students

9. Show number of mature women students over 25, fall 1969 (full or part-time) Number _____ 63-64

10. We offer a special program (such as continuing education) to encourage women to return to college to complete their education. Yes _____ No _____ 65

11. Opportunities are offered the mature woman to complete her education at our institution. Yes _____ No _____ 66

12. We provide counseling to the mature woman student in planning her course of study and in making the adjustment to college life. Yes _____ No _____ 67

13. Our institution makes special adjustments in curricula and class hours to meet the needs of mature women students. Yes _____ No _____ 68

		CODE (Office use only)
14. We offer scholarship help to needy mature women students. Yes _____ No _____		69
15. We furnish day care services for married women students who have small children. Yes _____ No _____		70

D. Administration

16. It is our policy to include women in

a. top-level administrative positions Yes _____ No _____ 78

b. policy-making decisions Yes _____ No _____ 79

17. During the past three years the professional administrative positions on our campus have been filled as follows (mark sex of person M or F, as appropriate, or NA if no such position exists): 80

	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	
a. Assistant Dean of Students for _____	_____	_____	_____	1-2
b. Assistant Dean of Students for _____	_____	_____	_____	3-4
c. College Counselor	_____	_____	_____	5
d. Director of Financial Aid	_____	_____	_____	6
e. Director of Placement	_____	_____	_____	7
f. Director of Development	_____	_____	_____	8
g. Business Manager	_____	_____	_____	9
h. Head Librarian	_____	_____	_____	10
i. Dean of a College (academic)	_____	_____	_____	11
j. Associate or Assistant Dean of a College/School (academic)	_____	_____	_____	12
k. Director of Counseling	_____	_____	_____	13
l. Dean of Students	_____	_____	_____	14
m. College Physican	_____	_____	_____	15
n. College Psychiatrist	_____	_____	_____	16
o. Vice-President	_____	_____	_____	17
p. President	_____	_____	_____	18
q. Other (specify) _____	_____	_____	_____	19
_____	_____	_____	_____	20
				21-22

18. We generally seek qualified women for our professional administrative staff for the following positions: 23-24

_____ 25-26

_____ 27-28

_____ 29-30

E. Faculty

19. It is our policy to grant maternity leave to faculty women Yes _____ No _____ 31

a. If so, for what period of time? (specify) _____ 32-33

34-35

		CODE (Office use only)
b. When granted, opportunity is given women faculty to continue fringe benefits during during the period of such leave, as for other types of leave (sabbatical, leave of absence for teaching elsewhere, consultant work, etc.)	Yes ____ No ____	36
c. When granted, we guarantee the faculty woman		
(1) rehiring in the same position	Yes ____ No ____	37
(2) rehiring at the same level	Yes ____ No ____	38
(3) rehiring at at least the same salary	Yes ____ No ____	39
(4) rehiring without loss of seniority	Yes ____ No ____	40
20. We have an institutional policy against nepotism	Yes ____ No ____	41
a. If not, in the past two years we have had a husband and wife on our faculty	1968-69 / 1969-70	
(1) in the same department	Yes ____ No ____ / Yes ____ No ____	42
(2) in different departments	Yes ____ No ____ / Yes ____ No ____	43
b. The same policy against nepotism applies to other relationships, such as		44
(1) parent-child	Yes ____ No ____	45
(2) siblings	Yes ____ No ____	46
c. There are some departmental exceptions to this policy.	Yes ____ No ____	47
21. Department Chairmanships held by faculty women on our campus are:		48
_____ _____		49-50
_____ _____		51-52
_____ _____		53-54
(Use other side, if needed.)		55-56
22. In what ways do faculty (and/or administrative women participate in University or College governance (e.g., University Senate, committees, etc.)? Please specify.		57-58
_____ _____		59-60
_____ _____		61-62
23. Our promotional policies are the same for men and women faculty.	Yes ____ No ____	63-64
24. We have ____ trustees (regents), of whom ____ are women. (If more than one college, with a separate set of trustees, please indicate the same data for the other colleges on the back of this page.)		65
25. Comments		66-67
_____		68-69
_____		70-71
_____		72-73
_____		74-75
		76-77
Signature of President _____		78-79
		80

1/70

White copy: Return to Dr. Ruth M. Oltman, AAUW
2401 Virginia Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
Green copy: Retain for your files.

FEMINIQUE QUESTIONNAIRE
A. Coding

On all questions:

None	0 or 00
Not applicable (NA)	+ or ++
Information unavailable	- or --

Item: Identification — Column 1-2

State	Code	State	Code
Alabama	01	New Hampshire	27
Arizona	02	New Jersey	28
Arkansas	03	New Mexico	29
California	04	New York	30
Colorado	05	North Carolina	31
Connecticut	06	North Dakota	32
Delaware	07	Ohio	33
Florida	08	Oklahoma	34
Georgia	09	Oregon	35
Idaho	10	Pennsylvania	36
Illinois	11	Rhode Island	37
Indiana	12	South Carolina	38
Iowa	13	South Dakota	39
Kansas	14	Tennessee	40
Kentucky	15	Texas	41
Louisiana	16	Utah	42
Maine	17	Vermont	43
Maryland	18	Virginia	44
Massachusetts	19	Washington	45
Michigan	20	West Virginia	46
Minnesota	21	Wisconsin	47
Mississippi	22	Wyoming	48
Missouri	23	Alaska	49
Montana	24	Hawaii	50
Nebraska	25	District of Columbia	51
Nevada	26		

Item	Description	Column	Code
Institution	Name	3-4	
A-1	Type of Institution	5-6	
	Federal		01
	State		02
	County		03
	City		04
	Independent, non-profit	7-8	01
	Religious affiliation		02
	Other		03
A-2	Specific religious affiliation	9-10	
	Methodist		01
	Congregational		02
	Presbyterian		03
	Catholic		04

Item	Description	Column	Code
		Lutheran-America	05
		Mennonite	06
		Baptist	07
		United Church of Christ	08
		Disciples of Christ	09
		Assembly of God	10
		Friends	11
		Seventh Day Adventists	12
		Church of the Brethren	13
		Reformed Church in America	14
		Moravian	15
		Nazarene	16
A-3	Coed Status	11	
		Coed	1
		Women only	2
		Other	3
		Coordinate	4
A-3	Year Coed	12-13	
		1800-1829	10
		1830-50	01
		1851-70	02
		1871-90	03
		1891-1910	04
		1911-30	05
		1931-50	06
		1951-60	07
		1961-65	08
		1966-present	09
Students			
B-1	Positions of leadership		
	a. Pres. of student body	14	
		F 67-68	1
		F 67-68, 68-69	2
		F 68-69 only	3
		F all 3 years	4
		F 68-69, 69-70, but not 67-68	5
		F 69-70 only	6
		Men only	7
		Both	8
		F 67-68, 69-70, but not 68-69	9
	b. Chairman of the campus judicial board	15	(Coding
	c. Chairman of the activities committee	16	same as
	d. Editor of campus newspaper	17	above)
	e. Editor of the yearbook	18	
	f. Editor of a literary magazine	19	
	g. President of the honors council	20	
	h. Captain of the debate team	21	
	i. Class President	22	
	j. Chairman of orientation for freshman	23	
	k. Chairman of Union Senate or Union Board of Governors	24	
	l. Officer in S.D.S. or other radical group	25	
	m. Senators	26	
	n. Senate Chairman	27	
	o. Other	28	

Item

B-2 a. Total number graduating (Column 29-30)

	Code
50 or less	01
51-100	02
101-150	03
151-200	04
201-300	05
301-400	06
401-500	07
501-600	08
601-700	09
701-800	10
801-1000	11
1001-1500	12
1501-2000	13
2001-2500	14
2501-3000	15
3001-3500	16
Over 3500	17

Men (Column 31-32)

	Code
50 or less	01
51-100	02
101-150	03
151-200	04
201-250	05
251-300	06
301-350	07
351-400	08
401-450	09
451-500	10
501-550	11
551-600	12
601-650	13
651-700	14
701-750	15
751-800	16
801-850	17
851-900	18
901-950	19
951-1000	20
1001-1500	21
1501-2000	22
Over 2000	23

B-2 Women (Column 31-32) coded same as Men above.

B-3 Number of programs on women's interests (Column 53-54)

	Code		Code
1-2	01	17-18	09
3-4	02	19-20	10
5-6	03	Over 20	11
7-8	04	Series	12
9-10	05	+ Accredited course	13
11-12	06	Many	14
13-14	07	Some	15
15-16	08	Few	16

B-4 a. AWS on campus (Column 55)

Yes	1
No	2

B-4 b. Budget (Column 56)

Yes	1
No	2

B-5 Representation of women (Column 57)

a. As proportionately as men	1
b. In smaller numbers than men	2
c. In greater numbers than men	3

B-6 a. Pregnancy (Column 58)

Yes	1
No	2

B-6 b. Reside in halls (Column 59)

Yes	1
No	2

B-7 Married women reside in halls (Column 60)

Yes	1
No	2

Item

B-8 Birth Control Information

		Code			Code
a.	Health service (Col. 61) Yes	1	b.	Referred (Col. 62) Yes	1
	No	2		No	2

C-9 Number mature women students (Column 63-64)

Less than 25	01	151-200	07
25-50	02	201-250	08
51-75	03	251-300	09
76-100	04	301-350	10
101-125	05	351-400	11
126-150	06	Over 400	12

C-10 Offer program for mature women (Column 65)

Yes	1
No	2

C-11 Opportunities to complete degree (Column 66)

Yes	1
No	2
Limited to faculty wives	3

C-12 Counseling for mature women (Col. 67)

Yes	1
No	2

C-13 Adjustments in curricula (Col. 68)

Yes	1
No	2

C-14 Scholarship help (Col. 69)

Yes	1
No	2

C-15 Daycare services (Col. 70)

Yes	1
No	2

Size of school (Col. 72-73)

Under 500	01	3001-5000	07
501-1000	02	5001-10,000	08
1001-1500	03	10,001-15,000	09
1501-2000	04	15,001-25,000	10
2001-2500	05	Over 25,000	11
2501-3000	06		

Accrediting association (Col. 74)

S	1	N	4
W	2	E	5
NW	3	M	6

D-16 a. Women in top level admin. jobs (Col. 78)

Yes	1
No	2

b. Policy decisions (Col. 79)

Yes	1
No	2

Card I (Col. 80) 1

Card II

Item	Description	Column	Code
Identification	State (Coding same as Col. 1-2, Card I)	1-2	
	Institution Name	3-4	
D-17	a. Asst. or Asso. Dean of Students for Men	5	
	F 67-68 only		1
	F 67-68, 68-69		2
	F 68-69 only		3
	F 67-68, 68-69, 69-70		4
	F 68-69, 69-70, but not 67-68		5
	F 69-70 only		6
	Men only		7
	Both		8
	F 67-68, 69-70, but not 68-69		9
	b. Asst. or Asso. Dean of Students for Women	6	(Coding
	c. College Counselor	7	same as
	d. Director of Financial Aid	8	above)
	e. Director of Placement	9	
	f. Director of Development	10	
	g. Business Manager	11	
	h. Head Librarian	12	
	i. Dean of a college (Academic)	13	
	j. Asso. or Asst. Dean of a College/School (academic)	14	
	k. Director of Counseling	15	
	l. Dean of Students or V. Pres. for Student Affairs	16	
	m. College Physician	17	
	n. College Psychiatrist	18	
	o. Vice-President	19	
	p. President	20	
	q. Director of Admissions	21	
	r. Director of Curriculum Advisors	22	
	s. Admin. Asst. to President	23	
	t. Registrar	24	
	u. Director of Education and Comm. Services	25	
	v. Dean of College of Home Ec.	26	
D-18	Seek qualified women administrators	27-28	
		29-30	01-38
	Qualified persons regardless of sex except Dean of Men, Dean of Women or same for men and women		
	Dean of Students		
	Asso. Dean of Students		
	Registrar		
	Any position or all		
	College of Home Ec.		
	Student Development et al		
E-19	Faculty maternity leaves	31	
	Yes		1
	No		2
	No specified policy		3
	As needed		4

Item		Description	Column	Code
E-19	a	Period of time	32-33	
			3 mos.	01
			6 mos.	02
			12 mos.	03
			Indefinite or adjustable as needed	04
			One semester	05
			One month	06
			Two semesters	07
			Six weeks or less	08
			Two months	09
			18 months	10
	b	Fringe benefits	36	
			Yes	1
			No	2
	c	Rehiring (1)(Col. 37)	(2) 38	
		Yes 1	Yes	1
		No 2	No	2
		(3) (Col. 39)	(4) 40	
		Yes 1	Yes	1
		No 2	No	2
E-20		Nepotism policy against	41	
			Yes	1
			No	2
	a	(1) Husband wife, same dept. 1968-69	42	
			Yes	1
			No	2
		" " " " 1969-70	43	
			Yes	1
			No	2
		(2) " " diff. " 1968-69	44	
			Yes	1
			No	2
		" " " " 1969-70	45	
			Yes	1
			No	2
	b	(1) Parent-child	46	
			Yes	1
			No	2
		(2) Siblings	47	
			Yes	1
			No	2
	c	Departmental exceptions	48	
			Yes	1
			No	2
E-21		Departmental Chairmanship	49-56 70-71 76-79	
			Dental Hygiene	01
			Education, including elementary, special	02
			English, Journalism, Speech, Theatre Arts	03
			Fine Arts and history of	04
			History, Government and Political Science	05
			Home Economics	06

Item	Description	Column	Code
E-21	(Departmental Chairmanship)		
	Languages		07
	Math		08
	Music		09
	Nursing		10
	Philosophy		11
	Phys. Ed.		12
	Psychology		13
	Science - biol. and geol.		14
	" - chem., physics, astron.		15
	Social and anthr.		16
	Occupational or physical therapy		17
	Rotate		18
	et al		to 33
E-22	Participation of Women	57-64	
	All levels or all policy committees and boards		01
	Committees, nearly all		02
	Curriculum comm.		03
	Advisory comm.		04
	Ed. policy		05
	Academic Standing Comm.		06
	U. Senate		07
	Faculty Council		08
	et al		to 28
E-23	Promotional policies, same for men and women	65	
		Yes	1
		No	2
E-24	Number trustees	66-67	
	Less than 5		01
	6-9		02
	10-12		03
	13-15		04
	16-18		05
	19-21		06
	22-24		07
	25-27		08
	28-30		09
	Over 30		10
	Number women trustees	68-69	
	1		01
	2		02
	3		03
	4		04
	5		05
	6		06
	7		07
	8		08
	9		09
	10		10
	11		11
	12 or more		12
		70-71	(Added to 49-56 as needed)
	Size of school (same as on Card I)	72-73	
	Accrediting association (same as on Card I)	74	
	Comments	75-79	(Added to 49-56 as needed)
	Card II	80	2

QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions for Data Processing

1. Key punch from coded source documents.
2. Use total card decks (each questionnaire has 2 cards) and compute the data given in A (coding ranges) and means indicated in B-5.
3. Divide card decks according to the variables listed in B (variables) and compute the same lists of data as for the total.

Note: The breakdown for coding responses is shown in Appendix C. These were reviewed with a computer consultant for ease in recording and tabulation. Extra columns allowed for unanticipated responses were found to be needed. One specialist was hired to do all of the coding directly on the questionnaire, so that there was continuity and consistency in recording the responses.

The questionnaires then were turned over for key punching and computer analysis as shown in this appendix.

A. Coding Ranges

Card I

Question	Code Column	Range
State	1-2	01-51
School	3-4	01-25
A 1	5-6	01-08
2	7-8	1-3
2b	9-10	01-16
3	11	1-4
3a	12-13	01-10
B 1	14-28	1-9
2a	29-30	01-17
2a	31-32	01-23
2a	33-34	01-23
2b	35-36	01-08
2b	37-38	01-08
2b	39-40	01-08
2c.2d	41-52	Omit
3	53-54	01-16
4a	55	1-2
4b	56	1-2
5	57	1-3
6a	58	1-2
6b	59	1-2
7	60	1-2
8a	61	1-2
8b	62	1-2
C 9	63-64	01-12
10	65	1-2
11	66	1-3
12	67)	1-2
13	68)	1-2
14	69)	1-2
15	70)	1-2
	71	not assigned
Size	72-73	01-11
Region	74	1-6
	75-77	not assigned
D 16a	78	1-2
16b	79	1-2
Card	80	1

Question	Code Column	Range
State	1-2	01-51
School	3-4	01-25
D 17	5-26	1-9
18	27-30	01-38
E 19	31	1-5
19a	32-33	01-10
17	34	1-9, assigned
	35	w/21-26, as needed
19b,20c	36-48	1-2
21	49-56	01-33
22	57-64	01-28
23	65	1-2
	66-67	01-10
	68-69	01-12
21	70-71	01-33, assigned w/49-56, as needed
Size	72-73	01-11
Region	74	1-6
	75	Omit
21	76-77	01-33 assigned w/49-56 as needed
Card	80	2

Appendix D

B. Variables - Frequency Distribution and Percentages

1. Second Run - 2 decks (CC 11) - Card I, (CC 3) - Card II
   a. coed schools
   b. schools for women only

2. Third Run - 2 decks (CC 5-6, 7-8)- Card I, (CC 4) - Card II
   a. Public Schools
   b. Private Schools

3. Fourth Run - 6 decks (CC 74) - Card I, II
   a. Southern Association - S
   b. Western Association - W
   c. Northwestern Association - N
   d. North Central Association - C
   e. Northeastern Association - E
   f. Middle States Association - M

4. Fifth Run - 2 decks (CC 72-73) - Card I, II
   a. Schools under 1,000
   b. Schools over 10,000

5. Complete means for data in 1-4 for Card I columns:
   29-30
   31-32
   33-34
   35-36
   37-38
   39-40
   53-54
   63-64

6. Combine totals of columns 49-56 Card II - to get totals for category
   70-71
   76-79

   " " " " 27-28 Card II to get totals for category
   29-30
   34-35

Appendix E

ANALYSIS OF SUB-GROUPS IN STUDY SAMPLE

(Total group - 454)

Category	Coed Schools (376)		Women's Colleges (59)		Schools over 10,000 (63)		Schools under 1,000 * (53)		Public Schools (189)		Private Schools * (207)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Governance												
Public	182	48	5	8	50	79	2	4	189	100	--	--
Private	194	58	54	92	13	21	51	96	--	--	207	100
Independent	64	33	20	37	10	77	9	18	--	--	70	34
Religious Affiliation	130	67	34	63	3	23	42	82	--	--	137	66
Enrollment												
Under 1,000	50	13	37	65	--	--	7	13	2	1	51	25
1000-2000	96	26	16	28	--	--	46	87	14	7	92	45
2001-3000	40	11	2	3	--	--	--	--	21	11	23	11
3001-5000	43	12	2	3	--	--	--	--	38	20	7	3
5001-10,000	83	22	--	--	--	--	--	--	64	34	19	9
10,001-15,000	28	8	--	--	28	44	--	--	22	12	8	4
15,001-25,000	24	6	--	--	25	40	--	--	20	11	5	2
Over 25,000	10	3	--	--	10	16	--	--	8	4	2	1
Accrediting Region												
Southern Association	82	22	17	29	13	21	15	28	50	27	40	19
Western Association	14	4	1	2	4	6	2	4	6	23	9	4
Northwest Association	28	8	--	--	4	6	4	7	18	9	10	5
North Central Association	172	46	13	22	28	45	28	53	83	44	94	45
New England Association	17	4	8	13	3	5	--	--	8	4	11	5
Middle States Association	62	16	20	34	11	17	4	7	24	13	43	21
Coed Status												
Coed	376	100	--	--	63	100	49	93	182	96	195	94
Women only	--	--	59	100	--	--	--	--	5	3	--	--
Other or Coordinate	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	7	2	1	12	6

* Exclusive of women's colleges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. A.C.E. A Fact Book on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1970.

2. Astin, H.S. The Woman Doctorate in America. N.Y.: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

3. Dolan, E.F. and Davis, M.P. "Antinepotism Rules in American Colleges and Universities," The Educational Record, 1960, 285-295.

4. Goldberg, P. "Are Women Prejudiced Against Women?" Trans-action, 1968, 5, 28-30.

5. Harris, Ann Sutherland. "The Second Sex in Academe," AAUP Bulletin, Fall 1970, 283-295.

6. Horner, M. "A Bright Women is Caught in a Double Bind," Psychology Today, Nov. 1969.

7. IAWS. "Commitment to Planning," Feminine Focus, March 1970.

8. National Center for Educational Statistics. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1969 Edition. Washington, D. C.: HEW, U. S. Office of Education, 1969.

9. _____. Education Directory, 1969-70, Part 3, Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: HEW, U. S. Office of Education, 1970.

10. National Education Association. NEA Research Bulletin, Vol. 44, No. 2, May 1966, p. 56.

11. National Research Council. Summary Report 1969 - Doctorate Recipients from U. S. Universities. Washington, D. C.: Office of Scientific Personnel, NRC, 1970.

12. National Science Foundation. American Science Manpower 1968, A Report of the National Register of Scientific and Technical Personnel, NSF69-38. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

13. President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities. A Matter of Simple Justice. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, April 1970.

14. Shaffer, H. G. and Shaffer, J. P. "Job Discrimination Against Faculty Wives," J. of Higher Education, 1966, 10-15.

15. U. S. Office of Education. Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1969. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

16. Women's Bureau. 1969 Handbook on Women Workers. Washington, D. C.:U. S. Department of Labor, 1969.

17. _____. Trends in Educational Attainment of Women. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Labor, 1969.